

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/658,477	09/09/2003	Kenji Hirooka .	14109Z	4119
23389 7	590 11/16/2006		EXAMINER	
SCULLY SCO 400 GARDEN	OTT MURPHY & PRES	JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J		
SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3768	
			DATE MAILED: 11/16/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	т					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/658,477	HIROOKA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jaworski Francis J.	3768				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 136(a). In no event, however, may a limit will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become Ali	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/24	1/06 Amdt&TD.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ Thi	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowed) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 33 - 37 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 33 - 37 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or contact the specification is objected to by the Examin	or election requirement.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	3 ()	` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apprix documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/658,477

Art Unit: 3768

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 33 – 37 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 11 and 14 of newly issued commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 7122032 in view of Yamamoto et al (US4726229).

Since the patent claims include claiming of an electrically connecting portion in the microscope body for transmitting signals and/or power to an ancillary operating device, this may be considered to be broad claiming so as to embrace an investigative ultrasound device as well as various therapies and/or other imaging modalities such as optical for example, whereupon it would have been obvious in view of Yamamoto et al to operate an ultrasound imaging device as the claimed 'operating device' since it was

Application/Control Number: 10/658,477

Art Unit: 3768

heretofore known to image the same operative field with both modalities in association

with the microscope housing body.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski

Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fji

11-12-06

Francis J. čaworski Primary Examiner Page 3